

Disc

Christianity and Society

- The Triumph of Virtue in 1954

WILLIAM MILLER

- The Impending Crisis
of Desegregation

ALVIN WALCOTT ROSE

- Practical Guides
for "Christian Action"

- Editorials

- Book Reviews

Discarded
Yale Divinity Library

CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIETY

A Quarterly devoted to Christianity and Social Reconstruction

Reinhold Niebuhr, *Editor*

Arnold W. Hearn, *Associate Editor*

Douglas Sturm, *Managing Editor*

Christian Action

Reinhold Niebuhr and Liston Pope
Honorary Chairmen

Executive Council

Fern Babcock	George Kelsey
Donald L. Benedict	William H. Kirk
John C. Bennett	Huber F. Klemme
Florence Borgmann	Elizabeth P. Lam
Robert M. Brown	Ernest W. Lefever
David S. Burgess	David D. Lloyd
L. Maynard Catchings	Cornelius Loew
Rufus Cornelsen	Edward LeRoy Long, Jr.
Stephen T. Crary	Alexander Miller
Robert A. Gessert	Victor Obenhaus
Ray Gibbons	Prentiss L. Pemberton
Robert T. Handy	Albert T. Rasmussen
F. Ernest Johnson	Roger L. Shinn
Charles D. Kean	Kenneth Underwood
George D. Younger	

John C. Bennett, *Chairman*

Robert T. Handy, *Secretary*

Florence Borgmann, *Treasurer*

Douglas Sturm, *Executive Secretary*

537 West 121st Street

New York 27, New York

Table of Contents

	PAGE
Editorials	3
The Triumph of Virtue in 1954 by William Miller	7
The Impending Crisis of Desegregation by Alvin Walcott Rose (footnotes on pp. 27, 28)	9
Practical Guides for "Christian Action"	11
Book Reviews	29

Contributors in This Issue

• William Miller, well-known for his articles in the *Reporter*, is professor of philosophy and religion at Smith College in Northampton, Massachusetts. • Alvin Walcott Rose is professor of sociology at the North Carolina College at Durham, North Carolina. • Schubert Ogden is a graduate student in the field of constructive theology in the Divinity School of the University of Chicago.

* * *

Practical Guides for "Christian Action" will be available in reprint form.

* * *

This special issue which completes volume 19 of *Christianity and Society*, is actually the delayed summer, 1954, issue of the journal.

Christianity and Society is published quarterly by Christian Action. Subscriptions: U.S., \$1.50 per year; 40¢ per copy. England, 6 shillings per year. Australia, 7 shillings and six pence per year. Subscriptions should be sent to Mrs. Nola Meade, Secretary, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y., or to Rev. Norman Spoor, Annandale, North End Road, London N.W. 11, United Kingdom.

CHRISTIANITY *and* SOCIETY

EDITORIALS

The Growing Tension Between Nationalists and Internationalists

As well as including internationalists within its folds, the Republican party has always had a strong nationalist wing. Both Dewey and Willkie (the candidates defeated before Eisenhower was elected) were probably defeated because the nationalists failed to give them full support. Eisenhower's victory over Taft was the victory of the internationalist wing, a faction of the party which has an Eastern geographic base contrasted with the middle-Western and far-Western base of the nationalists.

Recent developments make it quite clear that a battle is building up between the two wings of the party on the question of co-existence. Though Eisenhower has vacillated on many issues he is fortunately firm on the question of preferring a long period of "competitive coexistence" with Russia rather than assuming the necessity of an atomic show down with our mortal enemy.

The nationalist wing of the party seemed for a time to include only McCarthy and Jenner, who has been propagandizing unceasingly for the severance of diplomatic relations with Russia. But the obvious adhesion to the nationalist line by the Senate leader, Senator Knowland, clearly manifested in his challenge to the Administration foreign policy and his call for a review of the policy by Congress, gives the whole nationalist position a much more ominous proportion. Incidentally, it is significant that the nationalism of Senator Knowland manifests itself in an "Asia first" position. That has been in a curious way the position of American nationalism since the beginning of the Second World War.

Both the mood of the country and the fact that the Eisenhower Republicans, plus the Democrats, clearly have more votes than the nationalists reduces the menace of this

nationalist challenge, which, if it were victorious, would not only increase the danger of an atomic conflict but would leave us without allies in Europe or Asia in the event of such a war. Strangely enough the agreement between the Eisenhower Republicans and the Democrats on foreign policy imparts an ironic note to the frantic effort of Eisenhower and of Nixon to elect a Republican Congress. Certainly the victorious Senator Douglas is closer to Eisenhower on foreign policy than his defeated isolationist opponent who made a very belated pledge of loyalty to the Eisenhower program.

The issue of coexistence will undoubtedly develop and be finally related explicitly to the question of the admission of China to the United Nations. It will be remembered that on this question Britain and the United States agreed in postponing the issue until next year. That postponement covered for the time being the real conflict which exists between our nation and Europe, for the whole of Europe seems to be united in the conviction that we are wrong about China. There are few illusionists in Europe who expect Mao to become a Tito. They know that China is no ordinary satellite of Russia but they think that it would be to our advantage to have direct contact with China. On the other hand, though, the Europeans are pretty unrealistic about Formosa and disregard the immense spiritual investment which America has made in Nationalist China.

No doubt a compromise will have to be found between us and Europe on the China question. But no compromise will be acceptable to our nationalists. In fact any policy which will assure our position as the "leader" of the free world will not be acceptable to them. Whether this issue will

lead to a permanent schism in the Republican party is beyond the impenetrable veil which hides the future. The only reassuring fact is that on the issue of peace and the hazards of an atomic conflict the usually pliant Eisenhower seems to be inflexible. His whole experience and his habits of loyalty to a nascent community of free nations, which he helped to build, probably accounts for this inflexibility. We should all be grateful for this hard core in his character and we should be equally grateful that a Republican president has taken the leadership in a "peace party," even if we did not vote for him. The ways of providence in the tangled skein of history are wonderful.

R. N.

The Developments in Indo-China

The remnant of Vietnam, left after the Geneva conference ceded a part of the country to the Communists, seems intent on committing suicide. Bao Dai, the Chief of State, is with his mistresses in the French Riviera. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Defense are in a conflict which may lead to civil war. The reforms which were promised are slow in taking shape. Meanwhile the Communist government is consolidating itself. When the elections are held in 1956 only a miracle can prevent a Communist victory in the whole of Vietnam. These developments are very dismal and ominous for the cause of the free nations, but they will remind us of the futility of the policy of our "Asia firsters" of relying on military power alone to save the "free world" in Asia. Would it not have been tragic to sacrifice American lives to hold the line for forces which are unable to hold their own against communism on the economic, moral, and political level?

In Asia we have a decaying feudal and colonial order. The people are filled with resentments against imperial powers. Some of these powers did not do a good enough job in education to provide the people with the resources for self-government which they so earnestly and justly desire. Even at best they could not have telescoped into a short

time the developments which transmute a feudal-agrarian civilization into a commercial and industrial economy and a democratic political order easily. In Europe that development required at least four centuries.

We must bear these hazards to our cause in mind if we are, as a nation, to preserve a proper patience in the long struggle with communism for the loyalty of the Asians to the cause of the "free world."

R. N.

The Problem of Germany and France

In a thoughtful article published in the weekly *Commonweal*, Professor Hans Morgenthau raises some very fundamental questions in regard to the American policy toward both Germany and France. Morgenthau believes that we have unduly subordinated political considerations to the military objective of adding twelve German divisions to the defense system in Europe. Actually, these divisions are not very important, according to Morgenthau, because the Russians are held back more primarily by fear of a general war and by our atomic power. Moreover, the twelve divisions have been purchased at the price of the risk of alienating both Germany and France from the West. Morgenthau believes that the possibility of Russia's diverting the loyalists of either France or Germany, or both, is still very great.

The question will arise how Germany can be alienated by a policy which has given her both sovereignty and rearmament. Morgenthau believes that German opinion is not really behind rearmament. Many Germans are apprehensive about the German divisions because they think that it will interfere with the unification of Germany and that it is a threat to both peace and democracy. The threat to democracy is alleged to exist by reason of the new prestige which it gives to the military caste in Germany, with its unsavory record toward democratic institutions.

At first glance it would seem that Morgenthau has given too much credence to

neutralist sentiment in both Germany and France. Morgenthau does not oppose the right of Germany to rearm. He thinks that a sovereign nation is bound to assert this right. But he believes that our insistence on German rearmament has alienated democratic opinion and that even the minimal safeguards placed on armaments could not prevent an eventual bargain between Germany and Russia on German unification, particularly since the present Russian leadership probably has the imagination to make such agreements without requiring bolshevization in either Germany or France. In short the political consideration which has been left out of account, according to Morgenthau, is the inevitability of a strong and divided nation contriving its unification in some way. The danger is that it will be contrived at the risk of war and the alienation of Germany from the Western alliance.

These fears may be too speculative and the Morgenthau theory may not do justice to the loyalty of Western Germany to the Western cause. But the theory is shared by many thoughtful Europeans and accounts for the fear of German rearmament in both Britain and France. Perhaps the weakness of the theory is that no clear alternative policy is proposed. Professor Morgenthau is too much a realist to regard a neutralized Germany as a possibility or to believe that German power can be frustrated by any policy. His analysis however reveals the great hazards of foreign policy for an hegemonous nation like our own and the peril of solving questions too simply in military terms. Morgenthau is certainly right in suggesting that twelve German divisions are insignificant compared to the good will of either Germany or France or both. But it is not quite clear how that good will can be secured.

R. N.

Private and Public Power

The victory of Senator Neuberger in Oregon is a vivid rejection of the Republican policy of alienating the public power resources of the nation in favor of private power. That policy began with the gift of the off-shore oil resources to the states at

the very beginning of the Administration; and its most immediate chapter was written in the now notorious Dixon-Yates contract, which threatens the continued development of the whole TVA project.

On this issue the Eisenhower Administration is at its worst and farthest from Eisenhower's conception of the "middle way." The repudiation of the policy is most vivid in the Northwest, where the issue is a burning one. The defeat of Senator Cooper in Kentucky is also at least partly a repudiation of the policy by the electors in a region in which the benefits of the TVA are widely appreciated. On this issue of public power there is a formidable revolt of the people against Republicanism. It may well express itself even more explicitly in the 1956 elections.

R. N.

A Farewell to Andre Vishinsky

The death of the Russian delegate to the United Nations, Andre Vishinsky, prompted almost as many sermonic reflections among our journalists as the death of Stalin. But there was more pathos in the passing of a hanger-on like Vishinsky than in the death of the dictator himself. Vishinsky was originally a Menshevik. He sold his soul to the Bolsheviks and paid for his position by exercising his shining gifts as a lawyer and prosecutor in the famous purge trials. These trials proved that there was no dishonesty of which he was not capable. Despite the high price he paid for his position he was never trusted by his Communist masters. He made no decisions in foreign affairs. He was merely a vitriolic mouthpiece. At the memorial service in the United Nations, Senator Lodge paid an embarrassed tribute to "his undoubted talents." There was nothing else to say. It would require a true poet to depict the depth of pathos in such a life.

R. N.

Eisenhower's New Leadership

President Eisenhower's leadership has often been criticized in Christian Action circles but today we can say that on foreign policy his intuition is right and that he stands by it courageously. He feels in the right way

about the relation between America and our allies in the free world. His use of the idea of partnership in contrast to the idea of leadership some months ago seemed to mark a turning point. His resolute determination to avoid an all-out war in Asia has been evident on several occasions. The fact that his roots are in the army rather than in the navy or air-force may be a factor here because the army knows that it will get bogged down indefinitely in the mainland of Asia if there is such a war and hence it is a conservative force in comparison with the other services. He sees what the hydrogen bomb means and knows that a global nuclear war would mean the end of most of the things that are worth defending. He has become convinced that communism cannot be stopped in Asia by military force, that the only hope for the countries of Asia is to help them to develop social health and economic strength. The fact that the President is a general helps him in his arguments with some of his opponents and the fact that he is a Republican enables him to escape many of the brickbats which would be hurled against a Democratic president who might stand for the same things. The fact that he has a Democratic Congress may enable him to win the needed legislative support. These words may have a crazy sound but they point very soberly to a situation for which we may be most thankful.

J.C.B.

Reconsideration of the Security Program

The case of Wolf Ladejinsky has some of the characteristics of a last straw. It comes on top of the Davies case and we hope that it may really break the back of the present security program. It has brought to the fore some new critics of the program. It is a pleasant experience to be for once on the same side with Representative Walter Judd, a man of great integrity and devotion who has long had a large following in the churches as a Christian in politics but who most often has been on the "other side" of

the issues. Even the zealous screener of the State Department, Scott McLeod, passed Ladejinsky. The reaction in the press is as nearly unanimous for him as such things ever are. There is general agreement that the action against Ladejinsky will weaken our efforts against communism in Asia. The ironical thing about our obsession with security is that, as in the case of mccarthyism in general, it weakens us in our struggle against communism at the points where that struggle is most important.

It is good news that The Fund for the Republic is launching a study of the security program and is doing so under the auspices of the New York Bar Association. It is fortunate that a conservative southern Democrat, Senator Olin Johnston, is out to give this whole situation a thorough airing. The partisan motive, when it is not allowed to run wild, may play a constructive part in forcing a show down on an issue of this kind. The many stories of shameful injustice to individuals which come from pastors in Washington who have been in the best position to know about them and the bad morale of many government departments make this issue urgent; next to foreign policy it may be the most urgent issue.

J. C. B.

Dr. D. B. Robertson of Berea College has prepared a bibliography of Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr's writings. It is a pamphlet of sixty pages and life is too short to count the number of items in it; how any one person could have written them all will remain a mystery. One special value which the pamphlet has comes from the fact that Dr. Niebuhr has done his best writings on many subjects in articles, editorials and even in book reviews and it is hard to keep track of them. The bibliography can be obtained for \$1.00 including postage by writing to the Berea College Press, Berea, Kentucky. (This paragraph is being published without Dr. Niebuhr's knowledge.)

J. C. B.

The Triumph of Virtue in 1954

WILLIAM MILLER

The Democratic Digest said of the 1954 election, perhaps a bit smugly, that virtue had triumphed. But if virtue did triumph, it may have been less the virtue of Democratic policies than the virtue of democratic structure and method. Let's look at the gains in three areas: 1. policy, 2. structure, 3. ground-rules.

1. There were quite significant gains for the worthier policies which in general the Democratic party represents more than its opponent. There was a change toward more democratic, more liberal, and perhaps more responsible office-holders (these are not the same thing but they do tend to vary directly with each other). In the Senate, for example, in a year when a frighteningly large number of the best Democratic Senators were up for re-election, none were lost, Douglas and Humphrey were returned with gratifying margins, an excellent new Senator was added (Neuberger), two old friends were returned (O'Mahoney and Barkley) and the losses among veterans were confined to the somewhat more dispensable Senator Gillette. We are told that the proportion and the effect in the House is similar; Democratic gains were by no means confined to the South; there were gratifying victories by liberal Democrats over very unpleasant Republicans like Kirsten of Wisconsin, and Kit Clardy of Michigan. The gains by Democrats have perhaps been less appreciated than they should be because of all the journalistic pontificating about mid-term patterns and the Democratic trend; a Democratic sweep was oversold before the election, and so some of the important psychological effects of an actual, though slight, victory was removed. Most important of all, of course, is the fact that the gains were enough to give Democrats control of committees. There gains will not mean the chaos which the President predicted in the campaign, but rather more hopeful possibilities for the more hopeful parts of his program.

In foreign policy the combination of Eisenhower, with his respectability and weight with Republicans, and a Democratic Congress, may be able to enact measures, say a more permanent extension of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and other measures toward freer trade, and new departures in economic aid to Asia such as the new Dodge study portends, which would be all that could be done by any combination. In domestic policy the Democratic Congress means that unfortunate trends in Republican activity, say in areas of public power and internal security, will be halted or slowed down. There will be at least a better administration of the investigative committees dealing with subversion, and possibly a reform in structure and procedure. The election served notice that any unemployment is translated into very direct political terms, so that no administration can afford to be even as mildly insensitive as the Eisenhower Administration seemed to be.

2. But though the Democrats elected governors and legislators in a slightly larger number than their opponents, their "virtues" did not triumph as decisively as some of us who are Democratic might have liked. They did not provide that landslide or national trend or sweep which broadcasters and journalists look eagerly for, and without which they find an election disappointing. It might have been nice had the Eisenhower Administration, and especially the activities of the right-wing of the Republican party, been more definitely repudiated in the election. But on the other hand there is much to be said for a close election. Landslides may not be an altogether healthy phenomenon, particularly in an age when all the world depends on a certain continuity of American policy. Christian Action has from the start been interested in healthy two party competition, in which each of the major parties bids well for the support of majorities, is therefore the captive of no

single interest but is forced in some measure to combine interests into an overall and national program, in which each party forces the other to put forth its best men and broadest appeal and each checks and restrains the other with the threat of an overturn, and in which public attention can be focused selectively on the areas and policies critical at the moment. Kenneth Underwood, the most effective spokesman in our ranks for the virtues of this major party competition, finds the 1954 election a great victory for the party system. This victory may be seen in: 1. the close race between the parties in the nation as a whole, in which, outside the South, the parties received almost the same vote; 2. the closeness of many of the most important particular elections, as in New Jersey, Ohio, Connecticut, Oregon, and in many other places where the defeated party can hope to win next time and the victorious party has to be scared; 3. the retention by the Republicans of some of the Eisenhower toe-hold in the South, portending an eventual two-party competition there; 4. the moving by both parties toward the center away from the poles, repudiating bolters and doctrinaire groups which could not mold in with national party appeal; most especially this refers to the McCarthy dissidents; 5. the inability of mere "Ike" endorsement to triumph over actual party record in Congress.

But if the election indicated a considerable health in our party organization, it called attention again to certain structural defects which hurt that health: the gerrymandering and discrimination against urban voters in the North which results in most legislatures in Northern states, even now as they elect a Democratic governor, being rural and Republican by disproportionate allocation of seats; the seniority system in legislative bodies which puts a premium on one party areas where the lack of party competition returns some veteran time after time and gives him and the area and its interests disproportionate committee power; and most important of all, of course, the different constituencies and division of

power between executives and legislatures which result in divisions of party responsibility. The better the competition between the two parties, the more glaring these structural defects which antedate and cut across the party system become.

3. Whether virtue triumphed in the third major area, that of the ground rules of the campaign, is problematical. On the one hand, like all previous campaigns, this, too, was the dirtiest campaign ever fought. And it was the respectable Republicans, including the cleaner shaven ones from the Eastern wing, who engaged in some of the dirtiest campaigning. The attack by Ives and Dewey on Harriman was a cynical business, as also were the Nixon soft-on-Communism attacks on O'Mahoney, Murray and John Carroll and Stevenson and the Democratic Party generally. But the worst perpetrators of these attacks did not emerge victorious, and it is not clear that they made any net gain with their attacks.

These last two areas, increasingly important, are two in which official religious bodies could play a role as they cannot on most questions of policy. The National Council of Churches, for example, could deal directly with the justice and morality of gerrymandering and underrepresentation of urban areas, and the seniority system, and campaign ethics as it cannot with most domestic economic issues. On the last, a committee which was willing to do more specific public treatment of campaign ethics than the committee formed during this campaign might help to educate Christians about political decision. If it could gain real respect, and publicize its criticism and praise widely and wisely, it might do a great deal more than the general commitments to clean campaigning can possibly do. There are a great many "virtues" in politics which need powerful and articulate promotion, which are not directly associated with partisan policy. These virtues of the party system and the ground rules are becoming increasingly important, and need victories like the mild one of 1954.

The Impending Crisis of Desegregation

ALVIN WALCOTT ROSE

I

On May 17, 1954, as everyone knows, the Supreme Court of the United States declared that "in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place," that racially segregated education by the several states is violative of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and that similar action by the Federal Government is violative of "due process of law" as guaranteed by the Fifth Amendment.¹

At that time, there were seventeen states and the District of Columbia, with more than fifty-one million people, in which public school segregation of Negroes and whites was required by law.² And under the protection of permissive legislation, public school segregation was also being practiced in sections of at least nine other states where live another fifty-three million Americans.³

Almost directly, therefore, the decision was of interest to most of the American people and was probably the most momentous civil rights pronouncement in three quarters of a century. For, recognizing that it may not for too long live aloof from the turbulence of the times, the Court struck at the very vitals of those of the nation's racial and cultural traditions which are now so repugnant to the national interest.

It is too early to determine reliably the decision's impact.⁴ Thus far there have been only minor open conflicts. Nevertheless, the dominant political leadership in parts of the deep South contends that a major crisis among the folk has been precipitated, that in the interest of the peace and safety and welfare of its peoples, a policy of outright defiance of the Federal law may be expected. Over the states of the upper South there has descended much of what Justice Douglas once called "the black silence of fear"; public discussion has been held to a minimum, and the leadership is "studying and waiting." In the midwestern border states (Kansas and Missouri, in particular) the decision

was to a considerable extent *ex post facto*, expressing in terms of the law what was already for the most part the general social conviction. At the national level there is expressed some fear that indeed the Constitution itself may now be imperiled, that the resistance to this decision will become part of "a systematic many-sided attack upon the Constitution, an attempt, that is, to subvert the Constitution by a process of perverse interpretation, nullification-by-indirection and direct encroachment."⁵

Now, however rough and inaccurate these estimations of the reception of the decision in the several regions of the country may be, they serve to point up the very problem which led the Court to restore these cases to its docket for partial reargument. In other words, the question now is: what are the lines of instrumental relationship between the Court's declaration and the people among whom the new principle of non-segregated public schools is to be operative?⁶

There are four developments which comprise the context of our problem. It may be helpful briefly to mention them.

In the first place, probably for centuries to come, certainly during the next few decades about which it is reasonably safe to forecast, segregated public education in America will be unlawful. The Court is not likely to reverse itself in this matter. Shifting circumstances and climates of opinion of course may come to pass; but when considering the long-term path of the law, the record is clear that *stare decisis* is not so fragile a thing as to bow before every wind.⁷ If it is contended the Court after more than half a century reversed itself in the present instance, it did so in recognition of the drastically changed role which public education now plays in American life. And it is inconceivable to suspect, so long as the nation remains free, that education in the foreseeable future will become less important.

In the second place, it may be expected

that specific techniques will be devised and used in some areas of the nation to circumvent the Court's decision and/or to delay its enforcement.⁸ The current literature indicates that some of these techniques will be gerrymandering, creating private schools, forcing ponderous and expensive litigations, invoking threats of economic and physical reprisals, legal evasions such as invoking the State's police powers, segregating on the basis of varying educational and cultural backgrounds of Negro and white children, residential segregation, voluntary agreements, and violence.⁹

In the third place, there have been discovered some specific community devices which have been and will be used to achieve desegregation. Professor Clark reports these to be desegregation via voluntary public opinion pressure, referendum of the electorate, the threat of publicity, moral persuasion, activity of community action agencies, personal decision of responsible authority, non-judicial governmental action, legislative action, the threat of court action, pending court decision, actual court action, and internal organizational pressures.¹⁰

In the fourth place, there must be considered the broad and basic social changes underway in the South which are now almost dramatically transforming the entire region. Among these are industrialization, agricultural diversification and mechanization, a widening population base of political participation, urbanization, the decrease in farm tenancy, increasing organized labor, the wide impact of mass communications media (television in particular), the emergence of a dynamic and responsible church, and the enlightening influence of social science research and teaching.¹¹

The new national legal principle of non-segregation, the concerted efforts to circumvent that principle, the plethora of movements to implement that law—these three, interacting within the context of a swiftly changing socio-cultural texture, provide the background of the immediate problem. That immediate two-fold problem may now be stated: (a) *how do we deal with the complex body of racial attitudes which comprise the rationale for segregation in such*

a way that desegregated public schools will be accepted and (b) how effective will be the several degrees and kinds of gradualism which may be embodied in legal decrees. For whatever the design of the enforcing decrees, the problem of implementation remains.

The first of these two questions is primarily a matter of considering techniques for translating into common acceptance what are now fairly well established psychological and sociological principles of racial and cultural relations; the second relates to the role and function of law in social behavior. It may be that in addressing ourselves to these questions we can more intelligently determine the consequences of each of the several alternative courses of action which the people may contemplate pursuant to what is now, in effect, the new law of non-segregated public education.

II

It will be helpful to realize that the dogma of equality, inalienable rights, freedom and justice—in which, as Mr. Myrdal so well perceived, Americans of all races, regions, national origins, and classes deeply believe—has constituted in the public conscience a general ideal which *ought* to control the lives of men but concerning which ideal there has been felt no corresponding *duty* to ensure nor the *right* of minorities to demand.¹² This is not to suggest that our egalitarian creed has not been a very vital core of American culture; such a suggestion would approach vulgarity and innocence. But, by and large, this ethos has in the minds of men remained “the great national suggestion,” to be gradually attained, but somewhat idealistic and utopian for present and constructive practice. It has been, as Professor Sorokin suggests, a *moral norm*, in the category of the Sermon on the Mount, in the sense that it has constituted *recommended* behavior without prescribing *requirements* for the majority to ensure it for all and without ascribing to minorities the *rights* to demand its actualization.¹³

On the other hand, “Western European
(continued on page 23)

Practical Guides for "Christian Action"

"The main concern of (Christian Action) is to find the most effective way of bringing testimony to the Christian faith in the affairs of human society, for the achievement of economic and political justice." (Reinhold Niebuhr)

"In the face of threats to civil rights and liberties, political party irresponsibility, economic and social injustices, international tensions and the lack of a strong, relevant social witness in the churches what can the Christian do?

"Christian Action is a group of men and women who are trying to answer this question, trying to take their faith seriously in the face of contemporary problems, trying to recognize the Divine Commission. . . . 'I have chosen you, and appointed you that you should go and bring forth fruit.' (John 15:16)"

Practical Guides for "Christian Action" is designed for two purposes: first, to provide suggestions for members of Christian Action by relating some of the experiences of other members and chapters, and second, to introduce other people to Christian Action, its purposes, organization and activities.

I. *What Does Christian Action Do?*

There are three functions Christian Action is trying to fulfill, each of which explains what the organization is and does.

1. Christian Action desires to *increase the sensitivity of church members* to the implications of their Christian faith for the social, political, and economic aspects of their lives.

In Chicago, a member of Christian Action, who is a medical student and layman in a local Presbyterian church, asked and received the permission of his pastor to hold a series of discussions for the laymen of the church on the relation of Christianity and social problems. All those interested bought copies of the book *Christian Faith and Social Action* (Scribner's, New York, 1953) edited by John Hutchison and written by members of Christian Action, and had small, informal, but highly intensive discussions on a different chapter each week. Many of those participating expressed how their eyes were opened to new dimensions of their faith which they had not before seen,

Some local chapters of Christian Action cannot assume a unity of theological conviction and thus quickly proceed to discuss the relation between the Christian faith and political problems. In Denver, for instance, the focus of concern was first a clarification of theological perspective. The first meeting was a spirited discussion of the theology implicit in the statement of purpose of Christian Action.

2. Christian Action *provides a fellowship* of support and criticism for persons who share a common religious loyalty and a common concern for the life of society. Here they find sustenance in the midst of isolation, a community of encouragement which provides needed assistance when they return to their jobs, churches, and other organizations. There is a core of conviction holding the group together, a general agreement on religious and social issues which draws the various members over the country into a closely knit community.

The Kyoto, Japan, chapter of Christian Action is a small, but highly disciplined group of persons, who formed their group around commitment to the Christian Action statement of purpose (see VII). They had long been seeking for a fellowship in which they could share feelings, thoughts and insights into what they saw as the relation of Christianity to the events of their day. Each member carries a portfolio on some aspect of current issues: Japanese-American relations, Diet proceedings, domestic economy, movements within the political parties. Meeting every other week, they share what they have found, and each awaits the critical insights of the others.

3. Christian Action provides an occasional *channel of corporate expression* on current issues, making statements where and when the members feel they must speak as a body.

On Saturday, April 24, 1954, the *New York Times* published the stand taken by Christian Action on the McCarthy issue. The article stated that "Christian Action, an organization of Protestant church men and women, made public yesterday a statement supporting public officials and church leaders who oppose Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican of Wisconsin. The statement linked Congressional investigations of communism with 'a totalitarian trend' termed 'a greater threat to our institutions than domestic communism.' Calling Senator McCarthy 'partly cause and partly symptom' of the trend, it urged Americans to resist 'this evil.'"

The statement included recognition that there is an important place for Congressional investigations, but it also included affirmation that such investigations must be conducted according to rules which protect the rights of witnesses and of persons investigated.

II. *How Local Chapters Start*

There is no set pattern for local chapters of Christian Action, no rigidly defined form to which local groups must conform either to organize or to function. Each situation is unique, and requires its own method for organization. In some cases, it is a matter of calling together those persons in an area who already are members of Christian Action. In other cases, one person alone must take the initiative of finding others in his community who are interested in social problems. Sometimes the national office can help by providing a list of Christian Action members in the surrounding environs.

1. In the early months of 1954 in Philadelphia, there were only two or three members of Christian Action. These men, desiring to form a local fellowship of persons committed to the purposes of Christian Action planned to hold a dinner meeting to which a number of speakers were invited to explain the movement and its concerns. The meeting was widely publicized and about 100 clergymen and laymen attended.

Speakers included Dr. Frank Graham, United Nations mediator for India and Pakistan and member of the Advisory Council for Christian Action; Dr. Albert Mollegen, professor at the Virginia Theological Seminary and active member in the fellowship; and Robert Gessert, at that time national executive secretary of Christian Action.

The mayor of Philadelphia and the city's managing director also attended the dinner, and welcomed the formation of the chapter, commending the objectives of Christian social action.

Out of this meeting the Philadelphia chapter was formed.

2. The chapter of Christian Action in Washington, D.C., began with an informal meeting of persons who were already members in the home of one of their number. They decided to undertake a project of studying our foreign policy, and concentrating on what might constitute a creative policy in the light of the Christian faith and teachings.

One of the members prepared a three page paper examining America's foreign policy, a copy of which was sent along with a covering letter to each of the persons who had attended the first meeting as well as to others who were thought might be interested. At the next meeting of the group, to which all these people were invited, the paper was discussed and another chapter of Christian Action had begun.

3. At Chicago, at the suggestion of one person, a few people already connected with Christian Action met together, talking about the urgent need of local chapters of the organization. After holding several preliminary sessions, the group formed a steering committee and a program committee. As a result of the work of these two committees, the organization for the chapter was set up and the program planned. Other persons were invited by letter and by personal contact, and thus the Chicago-Midway Chapter came into being.

After the initial meeting or two of the members and friends of Christian Action in an area, most local groups organize by electing a chairman, secretary-treasurer, and a small executive committee. These people become responsible for the continued program of the chapter. In Chicago, the executive committee was elected after a steering committee and a program committee had done much of the preliminary work. In other locals an executive committee is chosen immediately.

There is as yet no formal manner in which a group becomes an "official" chapter of Christian Action.

"We are not in the habit of formally ratifying or chartering local chapters where they have been organized. Notice from local leadership, made in good faith, that a group of people want to function as a chapter of Christian Action is sufficient for this office to recognize that group as a chapter of the national organization. The local chapter is given broad freedom and autonomy to develop its structure and program within the scope of the purposes of the national body, in accord with its own resources and to meet its own needs." (from a letter from the executive secretary to a member of Christian Action inquiring how to organize a chapter in his area.)

The organization of a local chapter is not an end in itself; it exists to further commitment to the purpose of Christian Action and to provide fellowship for those who share this concern. One of the leaders of the Indianapolis chapter expressed this in a letter to the national office when he wrote:

"We have had our first meeting in Indianapolis of Christian Action. Things went well, but we are moving cautiously on getting people just to 'join.' We want them convinced first."

III. Areas for Action

"Each Christian Action group should always be operating on two levels . . . a) clarification of goals, and b) development of means for achieving these goals." (John Turnbull, *Newsletter*, vol. II, no. 1)

One of Christian Action's brochures speaks of local groups as those places where one can

"a) study what the Christian faith means; b) study current cultural, political, economic, and personal problems in the light of that faith; and c) work out common plans for Christian action in the churches and in the community."

To "clarify goals," the members of a local Christian Action chapter need to spend time coming to an understanding of the Christian gospel, of the current issues of the day, and of the complex relations between these. Articles from *Christianity and Society*, social pronouncements of the various denominations, and of the National and World Councils of Churches as well as such books as John Bennett's *Christian Ethics and Social Policy* (New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946) are fruitful sources for discussions on fundamentals of Christian social principles. To keep up on current issues the "News of the Week in Review" in the Sunday *New York Times* and such news commentary magazines as the *Reporter* are extremely helpful.

The Chicago-Midway chapter of Christian Action held a discussion meeting at which Dr. Otto Baab spoke on "Motivations for Christian Action." The purpose of the meeting as publicized was to "probe the distinctive depths and resources of the Christian faith as it speaks to the social problems of our age, in an attempt to discover the peculiar orientation of specifically Christian social action."

At an all-day conference, the Cleveland group presented three topics for discussion: "The Theological Basis of our Christian Action," "Economic Policies of the Present Administration," and "The New Look in Our Foreign Policy." The *Cleveland Plain Dealer* carried a report of the meeting in its Sunday paper.

The members of Christian Action on the south side in Chicago spent a series of meetings examining the problem of race relations in the community especially as it faced them as citizens and as church members. During one of the meetings they had representatives present from various of the churches in the area who related how they had or had not met the problem in their respective congregations.

It is not enough just to become conscious of what the Christian faith means in relation to the many political issues of the day. It is also important for the members of Christian Action to come to a greater awareness of the respective roles they play in their communities. This can include studying the various occupations of the members of a Christian Action chapter and the various voluntary organizations to which they belong. In this way they might make a more effective witness to the faith in those situations.

The executive committee of the Christian Action chapter in New Haven for the year 1954-55 decided to sponsor various problem-centered series of informal meetings to help the members gain insight into the various facets of local community politics and the relationship of the local parish to them. Such questions as a) the role of the minister in partisan politics, b) the place of voluntary organizations, such as the Parent-Teacher's Association, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, and the Americans for Democratic Action, in local governmental situations, and c) the power of party leaders in the making of crucial political decisions will be considered.

Two years ago a Christian Action commission was formed to study Christian vocations, in an effort eventually to help the members of Christian Action in their various vocations come to grips with the manner in which each was involved in the social and economic situation of our age. At that time they studied specifically two particular vocational groups: people in communications enterprises, the radio, the press and television and people in local politics.

In a meeting of the Resource and Emphasis committee of Christian Action someone stated that it is not sufficient to study, for instance, the problem of "equality" in abstract terms without taking into account the problem as it confronts a person in a concrete vocational situation.

A doctor recently said of his vocational problem, "In the local medical society the Roman Catholic doctors always know where they stand on medical ethics. They act as a pressure group. None of us (Protestant doctors) necessarily want a counter pressure group. But we do want help on our specific problems. Maybe just to get together and talk them out would be a start."

A Christian Action *Newsletter* which came out two years ago presented four chief areas of operation for members of Christian Action to put their "principles into practice": a) the churches themselves, b) political parties, c) special interest groups, and d) the public press.

1. It was suggested that *in the churches* members of Christian Action could "sponsor a political forum (during election time) with local, state, or national candidates or representatives present," write letters and articles for church publications, include studies of political decisions in relation to the Christian faith as a part of church education programs, and begin to study and understand the

influence wielded by denomination missions and education boards and church presses in affecting public opinion.

In the Bronx during one election time, one member of Christian Action together with a few other persons got a number of the local candidates for office to come to some of the churches in the area to present their sides in the campaign. Candidates from all the parties accepted the invitation gladly. Some of the people attending the forum had already discussed the election, and were ready to quiz the speakers on their records of voting in the past and on their views with respect to issues forthcoming.

A member of the Executive Council of Christian Action wrote an article for his denominational periodical, *Presbyterian Life*, entitled, "Biblical Faith and Politics." It was his effort to communicate to church members who so often avoid politics by saying, "Politics is too 'messy' for the Christian" or "Religion and politics don't mix!" In the article he clearly and distinctly showed the biblical grounds for involvement in the realm of politics. He also wrote about the guidance given the Christian in the Bible as he faces political decisions.

2. Many of the crucial political decisions are made through the major *political parties*, but it is a sad fact that too few church members are active in any way in political parties. Just as few church members are really active independents in the realm of politics.

"It is the failure of responsible citizens to take part in political life which makes it possible for a few self-interested men to gain control over the parties." (*Newsletter*)

Even though Christian Action as a body is committed to no one political party, it does stress that involvement in the political scene is an important part of responsible Christian living.

One Christian Action member, recognizing that she had been negligent in her obligation to the political dimension of life, joined a party club, with great initial enthusiasm. Her enthusiasm was dampened when no one spoke to her during the first few meetings she attended. However she kept attending, speaking wherever and whenever she found opportunity. After about 18 months, she not only became well-known, but also was given one of the chairmanships in the organization. Through patience and persistence, she finally achieved a position of responsibility. A whole new dimension of life was opening to her in the exercise of her Christian sense of service.

3. *Special interest groups* represent a third area of operation for members of Christian Action. Many members are able to have an important influence by their participation in such organizations as labor unions, League of Women Voters, American Civil Liberties Union, Americans for Democratic Action, Parent-Teacher Associations, American Association for the United Nations, and others.

"As a Christian Action member, I deem my membership in these other organizations (ACLU, NAACP, and others) valuable in order to carry over into these channels important insights I have gained from my Christian Action group. But thusly Christian Action is fundamental to all these other activities; it is not just one other organization among many. It is rather the one and only place where I can gain clarification of important issues within a group of fellow Christians and where I can examine these other organizations to which I belong in order to serve in them more effectively." (from a letter to the executive secretary)

4. The *public press* and other media of mass communication play a large role in the creation of public opinion on social issues. It is important for Christian Action members to study the quantity and coverage newspapers and magazines give events in the social and political scenes, protesting when there is inaccurate or unfair treatment of those events.

A pastor in Christian Action when serving a church in Connecticut started a small discussion group on Sunday afternoons for the purpose of studying the newspaper, both its reports on happenings in the news, and its columns commenting on those happenings. Quite informal, the discussion group proved fruitful for those participating.

The editor of one of the local papers within Chicago wrote two editorials early in 1954 asking the readers not to attend the theater unless they first checked the cast with the American Legion or the local clergymen to ascertain if any communist sympathizers were among them. Two clergymen, Christian Action members, wrote friendly letters (not for publication) protesting the editorials, pointing out the dangers of such a procedure. The editor called each of the men, explaining that he didn't want to harm any innocent person. But there followed another editorial stating that the FBI is too limited to give accurate information on communists to the public, and that the public can get "the official record" from the House Un-American Activities Committee. The Christian Action members are still in contact with this editor, and are trying their best to use their influence in a responsible way.

IV. Types of Meetings

Each chapter of Christian Action is different, and each plans the type and frequency of meetings best fitted to its own needs.

1. Some chapters hold regular monthly or bi-monthly meetings.

One of the chapters in Chicago has been holding monthly meetings each with a different theme: among them "The Churches' Role in World Peace," "Means of Censorship of Obscene Literature," "The Church and Economic Life," and "The Church and Gambling."

The Kyoto chapter meets bi-weekly for informal discussions in the homes of the members.

A group within the Boston chapter has been having meetings every other week to study the Red China issue.

2. Other local groups hold only occasional gatherings and conferences.

The Delaware Valley Chapter of Christian Action because its constituency is spread over a wide geographical region, has found occasional dinner meetings best fitted to its situation.

The Berkeley, California, chapter held an all-day conference with discussion, speakers and panels on the topic "The United Nations and Red China."

3. Another type of meeting which has proved successful in some regions is the retreat.

In New York City, several members of Christian Action participated in a seminar-retreat on "The Minister, the Parish, and the Community." This chapter has also held retreats on "Christ the Hope of the World," the main theme of the second assembly of the World Council of Churches, and on current affairs, including discussions on foreign policy and the relation of national controversies to the local churches.

4. Small informal discussion and study groups are valued highly by some local chapters.

The Chicago-Midway chapter of Christian Action sponsored a small theological study group during its first year of operation. The group used various articles in *Christianity and Society* as a basis for its discussions.

A similar theological study group in New York City used Butterfield's book, *Christianity, Diplomacy and War* as a focus for some of its discussions. The chapter in New York has also found its "task forces" an important part of its program. Each task force has its own assignment, and keeps up on trends in current news on its topic, occasionally planning meetings for the whole chapter. There are task forces on civil liberties, the relations of church and state, local politics, and foreign policy.

Boston, operating on a similar plan, has a "sub-commission" on juvenile delinquency in addition to some of the above.

The executive committee of the Boston chapter held one meeting to discuss a paper prepared by one of its members and distributed beforehand on "A Theology and Strategy for Social Action." After the meeting one of the participants wrote, "The group was grateful for the opportunity it provided to discuss in a very vigorous way the basis for our Christian Action work which enabled us to get better acquainted with each other's thinking and to clarify the way in which we might move ahead as a group."

5. Public service meetings are sponsored by some of the chapters.

In the spring of 1954 the New York chapter co-sponsored a public service meeting with several other organizations, among them the American Jewish Congress, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the American Veteran's Committee, and the Association of Fraternal and Benevolent Organizations, on "The People vs. McCarthy."

The Chicago-Midway chapter co-sponsored a seminar on "The Church and War" in preparation for the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches discussions of international affairs. The meeting, open to the public, was also sponsored by the Fellowship of Reconciliation and the Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

The chapter in Southern California worked in cooperation with all the denomination social action groups in the area sponsoring a dinner and discussion with A. Dudley Ward speaking on "The Church and Economic Life."

V. Resource and Emphasis Committee

The national Resource and Emphasis Committee, which meets regularly, has the responsibility for focusing and developing the work of Christian Action as a whole.

The Resource and Emphasis Committee is just what its name implies—a committee which continually and intensively concerns itself with an examination of the purposes, functions, and program of the total organization in the light of the resources that are available to Christian Action, given the nature of the membership and the emphases which they can and should make.

The committee has appointed several commissions to help carry out its task for the current year, 1955.

1. The Foreign Policy and International Affairs Commission was formed to study and provide resources in some of the more pertinent issues on the international scene.

2. The Minister, the Parish, and the Community Commission is concerned to study such questions as the role of the minister in political party activities, the place of the church in social issues, and other related topics.

3. The Christian Vocations Commission deals with the doctrine of Christian vocation both in general and in particular, thus raising such problems as are faced by the Christian in politics, in medicine, and in communications enterprises.

4. There are also three ad hoc commissions studying the problems of desegregation, public versus private power, and those issues confronting the consumer in our economy because of the demands made upon him by the expanding nature of our economy.

All of the commissions are assigned by the Resource and Emphasis Committee to produce one and two page leaflets with suggestions for study, discussion and action, bibliographies, and plans for regional and chapter meetings.

VI. *The Value of Christian Action*

The particular value of Christian Action differs with each member of the organization.

1. For some members its main value is the *sustaining fellowship* it provides. It is the only place they can find an organized group of persons all of whom believe that the Christian faith is relevant to life in all its aspects.

"Let me take this opportunity to express my appreciation for Christian Action. In this somewhat reactionary mountain community I have the feeling that I am 'going it alone.' Christian Action is one of the few ties which I have with those who realize the impact of the Gospel upon the whole life." (from a letter received by the executive secretary)

2. For other members, the value of Christian Action is the *resources* it provides to examine the Christian faith in its relationship to the social and political dimensions of life.

"Participation in Christian Action is the only chance I get really to dig in and discuss the more basic issues involved in Christian living. It certainly has helped me learn a great deal both about the gospel and about our common social life. I surely do appreciate membership in the fellowship." (from a letter received by the executive secretary)

3. Members also find value in Christian Action as a *symbol* of an approach to social and political issues which has a positive thrust, yet avoids the pitfalls of identifying Christianity with any particular political system.

"Christian Action does represent a real consensus . . . (but) it is one of the essential characteristics of Christian Action that it does not claim to have already most of the answers. It is under an obligation to find some new answers, to find a new way that avoids the familiar stereotypes of 'right' and 'left,' a way that is controlled by a deep and sensitive concern for the welfare of people who are still exploited and neglected in our world and by the search for wisdom concerning the conditions that make for justice and freedom and fellowship in society as a whole." (John C. Bennett, "Focus for Christian Action," in *Christianity and Society*, Autumn, 1953.)

VII. *Statement of Purpose of Christian Action*

At the organizing meeting of Christian Action held in the fall of 1951 in Washington, D.C., a statement of purpose was formulated and adopted. This statement is an indication of the spirit and direction of Christian Action and gives a general outline of the purposes which draw the members together into a community of concern. It was adopted as follows:

"We believe the Gospel of Jesus Christ summons us to face fearlessly the political, economic, and social realities of our time, and to act responsibly for the healing of the whole man and of society. We are conscious of the need for a community within the churches working for a continuing appraisal and application of theology, liturgy, and church policy to these realities. We are convinced that God has drawn us together to organize such a community made up of men and women committed to common purposes. Our task is to work primarily within and through our churches and ecumenical agencies, such as the National Council of Churches. The true Church is God's instrument properly transcending class, racial, and national loyalties. We are members of churches; we share their shortcomings; and we are under divine obligation to bring their fullest resources to bear on our common tasks.

"We affirm that the Gospel impels us to work together for a responsible society—local, national, and world-wide—which will give each person or group a fair and equal opportunity to develop his full potentialities. This involves judgment on the political, economic, and social policies of our country; it also involves responsibility to seek constructive policy by aiming at a consensus on the relation of the Gospel to social issues

and by common action in the light of this consensus. Church members have a responsibility as Christians to work in the power structures and centers of influence in society, and to speak and act on concrete issues as they arise.

"Chief among the evils confronting the Church are wide economic inequalities, racialism, conflict in a divided world, and the growing insecurity, disillusionment and fear which have placed millions under the jeopardy of totalitarian enslavement. We recognize that our failures and shortcomings have contributed to this disorder, and that the menace of international communism reveals in a special way the failure of the Church to be true to its Lord.

"We reject all kinds of totalitarianism. We reject the absolute identification of capitalism, socialism, or any economic and political system with the will of God. Judgments about the political economy must be made as a response to the dynamic activity of God in concrete, specific situations and as an effort to integrate and coordinate these responses into some over-all policies. We reject the irresponsible exploitation of anti-communism to undercut freedom through intimidation. We confess with shame that we as a nation, though blessed with extraordinary power and wealth, have frequently been confused and have often failed men of good will who have looked to us for leadership.

"Though the majority of us agree that military power is necessary to withstand political tyranny, none of us places major reliance upon military power or accepts uncritically the decisions of the military. As churchmen we recognize that the paramount objective of both church and government must be to open channels of reconciliation, rehabilitation, and reform.

"These are some further judgments we make as Christians today in the present situation:

". . . Our American foreign policy should seek in cooperation with other nations, principally under the United Nations, the cooperative development of world resources and a firm defense against totalitarianism and against the domination of world markets by any one nation or coalition of nations.

". . . The national community through its government must take action to maintain a high and stable level of economic activity, avoiding inflation and depression.

". . . All discrimination and segregation on the basis of race, class, creed, or national origin must be eliminated from our national life. The Church must begin with its own sin in this area.

". . . There must be reform of American politics to secure responsible, cohesive party action and integrated administrative and legislative policy.

". . . Our traditional civil liberties must be preserved and extended in the face of attacks upon them which exploit present fears.

"May God rule our actions, overruling our errors, unto the redemption of the world through Jesus Christ. Amen."

VIII. *Bibliography of Books, Pamphlets, and Periodicals of Interest to Christian Action*

1. Bennett, John C. *Christian Ethics and Social Policy*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1946. 132 pages.

A simply-written critique of four Christian social strategies and the development of a fifth strategy. An introductory book on basic social ethics.

2. Brunner, Emil. *The Divine Imperative*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1947. 728 pages.

John C. Bennett calls it, "the greatest book on Christian ethics written by a Protestant in our time." For advanced readers.

3. Brunner, Emil. *Justice and the Social Order*. New York: Harper and Bros., 1945. 304 pages. A shorter and much more easily readable book than *The Divine Imperative*, dealing with many of the same topics.

4. *Christian Conscience and Weapons of Mass Destruction, The*. New York: Federal Council of Churches, 1950. 23 pages. Available at 10¢ per copy from National Council of Churches, 120 E. 23rd St., New York 10, N.Y.
A report of a special commission of 19 U.S. theologians under the chairmanship of Angus Dun. Dissenting statements by Robert C. Calhoun and Georgia Harkness are appended.
5. Fagley, Richard M. "Our Ecumenical Heritage in International Affairs," in *Ecumenical Review*, vol. 6, no. 1 (Oct. 1953). Reprints available for 5¢ from the Commission of the Churches on International Affairs, 297 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N.Y.
A summary of the pronouncements of two great ecumenical conferences (Oxford, 1937 and Amsterdam, 1948) on international affairs.
6. Heimann, Eduard. *Freedom and Order*. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1947. 344 pages.
A basic work on freedom by a member of the Advisory Council of Christian Action.
7. Holloway, Vernon H. *Christians and the World of Nations*. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1948. 96 pages. Available for 10¢ from Council for Social Action, 289 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N.Y.
An introductory study booklet on the subject of international affairs by an author trained both in theology and political science. Simply written.
8. Holloway, Vernon H. *Religious Ethics and the Politics of Power*. 1951. 72 pages. Available for 50¢ from Church Peace Union, 170 E. 64th St., New York 21, N.Y.
An excellent study booklet on the Christian faith and world politics for mature individuals and study groups.
9. Hutchison, John A., editor. *Christian Faith and Social Action*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1953. 246 pages.
A symposium written by several of the leaders of Christian Action, including an essay on the history of the thought of the group.
10. Lefever, Ernest and Reissig, Herman. *You, the Nation and the World*. 1954. 32 pages. Available for 25¢ from the National Student Council, YMCA, 291 Broadway, New York 7, N.Y.
A simply written but excellent study booklet on the social responsibility of Christians.
11. Long, Edward LeRoy, Jr. *Conscience and Compromise*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954.
A basic book on the relating of the Christian faith to the decisions of every day.
12. Nelson, J. Robert, editor. *The Christian Student and the World Struggle*. 1952. 81 pages. Available for 50¢ from the Association Press, 291 Broadway, New York 7, N.Y.
A generally helpful book. Note especially the chapters by John Bennett, Ernest Lefever, and Gordon Shull dealing with ethics and political responsibility in specific terms.
13. Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Christianity and Power Politics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1946. 226 pages.
14. Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Christian Realism and Political Problems*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1953. 203 pages.
15. Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Interpretation of Christian Ethics*. New York: Harper's, 1935.
The above three good books by an author who holds "that the modern Christian and secular perfectionism, which places a premium upon nonparticipation in conflict, is a very sentimentalized version of the Christian faith and is at variance with the profoundest insights of the Christian religion."
16. Ramsey, Paul. *Basic Christian Ethics*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1950. 404 pages.
One of the most widely used texts in Christian ethics in the U.S. today. For advanced readers.
17. Scarlett, William, editor. *Christianity Takes a Stand*. New York: Penguin, 1946. 128 pages.
Takes up some of the specific problems of our day. Simply written.
18. *Social Action*. Published monthly by the Council for Social Action of the Congregational Christian Churches, 289 Fourth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y. \$1.50 per year. Single copies 25¢
The series published October 1951 through May 1952 on "Christian Community" sought to relate an understanding of the gospel of Christ to domestic politics, economics, public opinion, international affairs, and the church. This group was especially good.

19. Temple, William *Christianity and Social Order*. New York: Penguin, 1943. 90 pages.
 20. Tillich, Paul. *The Protestant Era*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1948. 323 pages.
For the advanced reader. Basic questions are raised concerning the relevance of the Protestant institution in the "storms of our times."
 21. Williams, Daniel D. "Christian Faith and Social Action," in *Christianity and Society*, vol. 18, no. 2 (Spring, 1935), pages 7-13. This is available from the Christianity and Society office, 3041 Broadway, New York 27, N.Y.
- A fresh and illuminating study of the problem for mature readers.

IX. *Who's Who in Christian Action*

HONORARY CHAIRMEN

- Reinhold Niebuhr, Dean of the Faculty, Professor of Applied Christianity, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
- Liston Pope, Dean, Yale Divinity School, New Haven, Connecticut.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OFFICERS

- John C. Bennett, chairman, Professor of Christian Theology and Ethics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
- Robert T. Handy, secretary, Associate Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
- Florence Borgmann, treasurer, Administrative secretary, East Harlem Protestant Parish, New York

COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

- J. Gordon Chamberlain, membership committee, Co-minister, Riverside Church, New York.
- Robert A. Gessert, constitution committee, instructor in religion, Wesleyan University, Connecticut, executive secretary, Institute of Ethics and Politics.
- Arnold Hearn, acting chairman, editorial committee, instructor in religion, Princeton University, New Jersey.
- F. Ernest Johnson, resource and emphasis committee, Editor, *Social Action*, Study Consultant, Department of Church and Economic Life, National Council of Churches, New York.
- William Kirk, finance committee, Headworker, Union Settlement, New York.
- Edward LeRoy Long, Jr., stewardship committee, Professor of religion and philosophy, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, Virginia.

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

- Fern Babcock, Program Coordinator, College and University Division, National YWCA, New York.
- Donald L. Benedict, Minister, Inner City Protestant Parish, Cleveland.
- Robert M. Brown, Auburn Assistant Professor of Systematic Theology and Philosophy of Religion, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
- David S. Burgess, Georgia State Industrial Council, Georgia.
- L. Maynard Catchings, Associate Secretary, National Student Council, YMCA, New York, fraternal delegate to the Council from the Fellowship of Southern Churchmen.
- Rufus Cornelsen, Minister, United Lutheran Church, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Stephen T. Crary, Professor of Religion and Chaplain, Smith College, Northampton, Massachusetts.
- Ray Gibbons, Director, Congregational Council for Social Action, New York.
- Charles D. Kean, Rector, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D.C.
- George Kelsey, Professor of Christian Ethics, Drew Seminary, Madison, New Jersey.
- Huber F. Klemme, Executive Secretary, Commission on Christian Social Action, Evangelical and Reformed Church, Cleveland.
- Elizabeth P. Lam, Member of Commission on International Exchange of Persons and Conference Board of Associate Research Councils, Washington, D.C.
- Ernest Lefever, former Associate Executive Director, Department of International Justice and Goodwill, National Council of Churches, New York.
- David D. Lloyd, Executive Secretary, Harry S. Truman Library, Washington, D.C.
- Cornelius Loew, Associate Professor of Religion, Lake Forest College, Illinois.
- Alexander Miller, Professor, Department of the Humanities, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
- Victor Obenhaus, Professor of Ethics and Society, Federated Theological Faculty, Chicago.
- Prentiss L. Pemberton, Associate Director, Danforth Foundation, St. Louis.
- Albert T. Rasmussen, Professor of Christian Ethics, Colgate-Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, New York.

Roger L. Shinn, Professor of Philosophy of Religion, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.
Kenneth Underwood, Professor, Wesleyan University, Director, Institute of Ethics and Politics,
Connecticut.
George D. Younger, Minister, First Baptist Church, Rochester, Pennsylvania.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Hampton Adams, Minister, Park Avenue Christian Church, New York.
James C. Baker, Bishop, The Methodist Church, California.
Robert L. Calhoun, Professor of Historical Theology, Yale Divinity School, Connecticut.
Merrimon Cuninggim, Dean, Southern Methodist University, Texas.
Truman Douglass, Executive Vice-President, Board of Home Missions, Congregational and Christian
Church, New York.
Tilford E. Dudley, Political Action Committee, CIO, Washington, D.C.
Angus Dun, Bishop, Episcopal Church, Washington, D.C.
Sherwood Eddy, Writer and Lecturer, Illinois.
Herbert Gezork, President, Andover Newton Theological School, Massachusetts.
Charles K. Gilbert, Bishop, Episcopal Church, New York.
Frank P. Graham, Representative for the Commission for India and Pakistan, United Nations,
New York.
Emerson G. Hangen, Minister, First Congregational Church, California.
Eduard Heimann, Professor, New School of Social Research and Union Theological Seminary,
New York.
Gerald Kennedy, Bishop, The Methodist Church, California.
Dorothy Kenyon, Attorney at Law, New York.
Mary Ely Lyman, Professor of English Bible, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Benjamin Mays, President, Morehouse College, Atlanta.
Lilburn Moseley, Minister, First Baptist Church, Pittsburgh.
Walter Muelder, Dean, Boston University School of Theology, Boston.
Norman Nash, Bishop, Episcopal Church, Boston.
Edward L. Parsons, Bishop, The Methodist Church, California.
James A. Pike, Dean of the New York Cathedral, New York.
W. Norman Pittenger, Professor, General Theological Seminary, New York.
William Scarlett, Bishop, The Episcopal Church, Maine.
Paul Scherer, Professor of Homiletics, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Joseph Sittler, Professor of Theology, Maywood Theological Seminary, Illinois.
H. Shelton Smith, Professor of American Religious Thought, Duke University, North Carolina.
Robert C. Stanger, Minister, Bethany Evangelical and Reformed Church, Chicago.
Thelma Stevens, Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Social Relations and Local Church
Activities, Women's Division of Christian Service, Board of Missions, the Methodist Church,
New York.
Alfred W. Swan, Minister, First Congregational Church, Madison, Wisconsin.
Paul Tillich, Professor of Philosophical Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Henry P. VanDusen, President and Professor of Theology, Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Jerry Voorhis, Cooperative League, Chicago.
Winnifred Wygal, Writer and Lecturer, formerly of the National YWCA, New York.
Mrs. James D. Wyker, United Church Women, Columbia, Missouri.

THE PRAYER OF CHRISTIAN ACTION

(COMPOSED BY MORAN WESTON)

Almighty God, may Thy justice and peace be established among all men and nations. So guide and direct our action that Thy will may be done through us. Endow us with the will and courage fearlessly to seek Thy kingdom; and fill our hearts with Thy love and grace that we draw others unto Thee and turn none away; through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

(continued from page 10)

culture, which we share with the other nations that stem from the Egyptian, Greek, Judaic and Roman backgrounds, tends to ignore or deny the value and significance of other cultures. Toward the people of ancient lands, India, China, Japan, Africa, many of whom have cultural traditions, religions, philosophies and ways of life far more ancient than ours, we have had a curious attitude of smug complacency and often outright disdain, if not contempt. Toward other peoples, especially those of a different color, we have usually acted as the "master race" which had all the wisdom and enlightenment. . . . Like the classical Greeks we still regard those who speak with a different tongue to be pitied. . . . What Hitler, with his assertion of a German master race has done, is to reveal, in all its stark ruthlessness and self-centered, almost paranoid, distortion, what Western European culture has accepted as a major premise."¹⁴

Though somewhat reproachfully described, this latter theme, which is also deeply imbedded in our heritage has been the rationale of our relationships with the American Negro. Dr. Odum has recently suggested that, at least for purposes of understanding the problem of desegregation, "it is of the utmost importance that Southerners face the plain assumption that they do not appraise the Negro as the same sort of human beings as they themselves are."¹⁵ This, of course, is a national tendency, but since its greatest emphasis is in the South, we shall call it here, using Dr. Odum's terminology, the Southern Credo.¹⁶

The research seems fairly conclusive that many southern white people have esteemed highly both the American Creed and the Southern Creed. But, while the American Creed, as we have indicated, has been considered a *moral norm*, in the sense of recommended behavior with no corresponding obligations and rights, the Southern Credo has been viewed as the *unofficial legal norm*, not primarily as expressed in the written law, but in a deeper sense as a part of the culture with its implicit and explicit master-servant expectations and/or ideology.¹⁷

Recognizing these two dominant cultural

themes in our heritage, one is led to offer at this point three parenthetical observations. In the first place, it is exceedingly appropriate that one should raise the question, as indeed some educators of known integrity are doing, of what desegregation will do to *white* southern children. A part of the answer is that desegregation will offer the possibility of obviating the personality conflicts which these dual cultural valuations inculcate, emancipating the minds and characters of these white children from the errors of the Southern Credo with its obsolete ideas, distorted conceptions and beliefs which by their very nature hamper and stultify intelligence. It is clear also that when one questions the ability of Negro teachers to transmit in a desegregated school the cultural heritage to white students, a part of the answer depends upon which of these two cultural themes it is the intention to transmit. Without considering how many, if any, Negro teachers should teach in an Alabama desegregated school, one may suggest that a criterion more important than race might be the ability of the teacher, irrespective of race, to transmit those of the values of Western civilization that are consistent with a democratic society. And, thirdly, the argument that the presence in a desegregated school of Negro children would unjustly lower the level of education couches the rather serious misconception that democracy allows in its philosophy a dichotomy of means and ends, rather than affirming that all means are proximate ends and all ends are but means to more remote ends. All there is to life, Aldous Huxley once put it, is in the living of it day by day; this is the essence of his thesis that "knowledge is always a function of being."¹⁸ One may assume Mr. Charles Johnson means essentially the same when he observes that "the way in which learning takes place is more important than the particular facts which are learned."¹⁹

It is of course true that American Negroes generally have not been allowed an unobstructed participation in the mainstream of American life; though his culture is uniquely American, the Negro child in Alabama is likely to bring to the integrated school

a smaller and more circumscribed fund of experiences. So will thousands of southern white children.

Because of residential housing patterns, there will be few children of either race going to a previously segregated school in the urban areas. The relative sameness of cultural experiences of Negro and white children in the rural areas will minimize the problem there.²⁰ The choice, therefore, is to deny these children the advantage of the experience of integrated education or confront the task of educating children of varying backgrounds.

Two rather deeply entrenched fears among white people militating against the acceptance of Negro children are lodged in the assumptions that (a) Negroes are immoral and (b) Negro children are educationally retarded. These assumptions, too, are well known in educational sociology. The conviction of Negro immorality we have found in large measure to be a function of "visibility."²¹ Through community self-surveys, community-action groups may find it beneficial (a) to show in an empirical manner the incidence of specific indexes of immorality among Negro and white children, (b) to demonstrate empirically the relationship between "morality" and such social factors as housing, income, recreation facilities, employment of parents, social and sanitary services, socially prescribed levels of aspiration, and social class, and (c) to point up the relationship of "morals" to achievement and mobility. The white community, along with the Negro, should be a source of data in this matter. Any Negro who does not fit the stereotype of immorality is likely to be written off as an exception; Dr. Rufus Clement will be seen as an "exceptional Negro" rather than an exceptional School Board member.

There was once a man who had no formal education, who in later adolescence was mixed up in a rancid love affair, was exiled because of his youthful indiscretions, was sold into slavery for five years, was the father of an illegitimate child, was convicted of fraud as a tax-collector and sentenced to prison, later lived with his daughter and sister in a house of questionable reputation,

encouraged his daughter to enter upon the "oldest profession in the world," living on the resulting income, and finally was arrested for murder when a dying libertine was found in his apartment. This man, the son of a quack doctor, was Cervantes, the author of *Don Quixote*, one of the greatest novels the world has read.

It is probably more generous than accurate to write off Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra as an exception among the pillars of our heritage. But it will not be necessary to resurrect the personal lives of Rousseau and Jefferson to convince white southern children that "it is no disparagement of the rose bush that it grows out of common soil, that the food of beauty is compounded of moisture and mud, that if the life of Cervantes had not been so bitter, the story of *Don Quixote* may not have been so sublime."²² A job of education on matters of morals may have to be done on the leaders in the power structure of many southern communities, perhaps, but experience would suggest that among public-school white and Negro children the question of Negro immorality does not seriously arise.

With regard to the educational retardation of Negro children as a rationale for gradualism, we must help the protagonists avoid, if we can, reversing for sake of sheer expediency their original positions concerning the quality of segregated education. A considerable burden of Florida's argument for indefinite gradualism, for instance, is that Negro children are educationally retarded.²³ The problem of educational research is (a) to demonstrate empirically *anew* that the retardation in question is a function of the inferior segregated school, the segregated economy and significant social factors, rather than a characteristic of the Negro child, and (b) to show the influence which integrated education may be expected to have on the quality of education.

III

Now, we have discussed this rationale of the Southern Credo because this body of racial attitudes comprises the unofficial law

of the South. Every society has its unofficial law which exists side by side with the official law, and except where the society is static, the unofficial law (that is, the attitudes and practices regarding the phenomenon which the official law is supposed to regulate) seldom coincides with and often contradicts the official law. But there is a respect in which our problem of desegregation in the South is unique. Except in such rare instances as the prohibition laws, the unofficial law is always the initiator of social change, moving so far ahead of the official law until the latter has become so antiquated and obsolescent that the folk require its revision. Seen from a world or even national perspective, such has been the path of the law in the problem of segregation. But not so from the perspective of millions of white Americans in the South. From the Southern perspective it is clear that for many people the official law of desegregation is far ahead of the slowly emerging attitude that would support desegregation. This new official law did not stem from Southern folk. Yet it is not likely to be rescinded, the world opinion will not long tolerate its flagrant abrogation. We have here, in other words, a normal socio-legal development in the larger view of world organization, but from the vantage-point of the American South it amounts to a discrepancy between the official law and the unofficial law in a direction that is counter to the usual progression of orderly society. This is such stuff as serious conflicts are made of; responsible statesmanship is of the essence.

Ordinarily there would exist three alternatives. The society might rationalize the new official law into the vertiginous heights of unreality where it would operate as a moral norm, in the form of recommended but not required behavior. This could conceivably be accomplished by a decree of almost indefinite gradualism, and such is the hope of much Southern leadership. It is an alternative that is finding expression in sophisticated places:

"The Supreme Court decision of segregation is not a mountain peak in the social history of this country. Rather,

it is a significant marker on a long road, much of which is yet to be traveled. As noted by a Southerner, in this issue, the Supreme Court has told us the Christian and democratic thing to do, but the problem is still a difficult one. . . . When through education we can raise the economic status of the Negro—when we can give him educational opportunities that enable him to develop his abilities to make a greater contribution to the achievements of this land—then we may happily see respect and appreciation taking the place of prejudice."²⁴

One is reminded of the Irish Municipal Council which is supposed to have voted three resolutions at one meeting.

"They were: (1) Because the old jail is inadequate and collapsing, the jail should be torn down and rebuilt.

(2) For the purpose of economy, the old materials in the jail should be used in the rebuilding.

(3) The prisoners should be housed in the old jail till the new one is constructed."²⁵

This is really what happens when an official law is rationalized through the unofficial law into the latent culture so that it becomes a moral norm. It is under the color of desegregation as a moral norm only that, at least within the hard core of the deep South, essentially *de facto* segregated education could continue for decades. A Supreme Court decree which hands to the several District Courts the problem of implementation could accomplish that result. The rationale could be that the May 17th decision has in large measure saved the nation's face in the market places of world opinion: a gentle handling of implementation via the District Courts will at least preserve order within the Union, and American Negro leadership can be depended upon at least not to transgress the orderly processes of law in order to continue the struggle of its people for equality. Some may be saddened at such a compromise of a nation with its essential ideals, but such has been the character of much social change.

There remain the alternatives of (a) allowing a reasonable period of about ten or fifteen years for the states to bring the unofficial law, the Southern Credo, in line with the official law or (b) the demand that the South immediately comply with the law, within two or three years.

In much of the current literature, there is the proposal that Negroes be introduced in white schools only at the first grade, each new group being allowed to advance through elementary and high school until the system is completely integrated. This is what we are now calling "segmental desegregation" as differentiated from another gradualistic proposal, "quota desegregation." A distinguished Southern white educator, for instance, has recently suggested that an experimental community, with few Negroes, in our State of North Carolina be selected to attempt an immediate integration plan at all levels.

Dr. Kenneth Clark has appraised the evidence on a wide range of these proposals.²⁶ In general, these data which Dr. Clark assembled suggest that immediate integration at all levels, when seriously attempted, need not be more disruptive than gradual proposals. The difficulty is, however, that there are still many Southern communities where none of these techniques and favorable factors, as discussed by Dr. Clark, may be present.

Logically, one would suggest that within an adjustmental period of approximately five years, this nation—through its Department of Health, Education and Welfare and spearheaded by Southern white and Negro educational and religious leadership—could boldly devise and implement a five billion dollar program of adult education, teacher training, and administrative reorganization which could, even with inevitable difficulties, effect a system of total desegregation, accomplishing in that very process those improvements in the Southern schools and in the Southern economy which we so sorely need. A program of such imagination, magnificence and such plain, common-sense—presented to the Senate by such respected men as Russell of Georgia, Kefauver of Tennessee, Neely of West Virginia,

Barkley of Kentucky, Ellender of Mississippi, Sparkman of Alabama, Scott of North Carolina, Kerr of Oklahoma, and Fulbright of Arkansas—almost certainly would find a grateful and sympathetic reception by the Congress, the President, and, of course, the Supreme Court of the United States. That a clear presentation to the people of the repayment which such a program would yield to America in international good-will, in internal personal security and social harmony, and in the respect for us by our children and our children's children—that this would win their passionate support, it is difficult not to believe.

But this is probably too much to expect of ourselves. Nations almost never act so concertedly and deliberately and with such enlightenment. The threat to our security and existence may have to be more direct, more external, more concrete and visible. We shall therefore probably have to work through it all in the kind of give and take which we as a nation know best. The Attorney General has the power to enforce the law, but the Executive arm will use discretion, knowing that the people will not want it to employ the nation's ultimate authority. Our international good-will and position may have to be diminished, our internal relations awkwardly accommodated. Current experiences in Asia and Africa demonstrate rather dramatically the difficulty of undoing an accumulation of decades.

On the other hand, this period of rapid transition is a golden opportunity for students of racial and cultural relations—an opportunity to orient first-hand, living facts to the significant paradigms in educational and sociological theory. Basic theoretical research, as well as experimenting with technical contrivances, are indeed, for the sources of insecurity, tension and group hostility are deeply imbedded in the culture of the West.²⁷ These forms of hostility stem from such psychogenic influences as the father's long day-by-day absence from the home, the precariousness of the mother's love (especially here in the South where the Negro nurse's role may be psychologically devastating), the delicate, transient identification of youthful males with their

mothers, the persistence of the expectations of female inferiority; they stem also from such socio-genic sources as the anxieties of a highly competitive economy, the pressure of what Mr. Riesman has called "other-directedness," the inadequacies of stereotypes as symbolic media for communication and interaction, the poverty of normal and diversified channels of tension-release, the atomization of sacred beliefs incident to industrialization and city-ways.

Mr. Parsons and his associates, for instance, suggest that every society, every cultural system, every personality are continually fashioning their careers in terms of five and more of these basic dilemmas.²⁸ Dr. Allport postulates a theory of affiliation, contending that all humans want (a) to preserve their self-esteem and (b) to have warm relations with their fellow men, and that, in proportion as man's affiliative needs are met, the negative reactions of prejudice and discrimination tend to disappear.²⁹ And Dr. MacIver contends that one of the really significant sociological principles of the Good Society inheres in "The Deep Beauty

of the Golden Rule."³⁰ It may be that educators and social scientists will want to work with theories less grandiose; but the field is theirs.

The general idea seems to be that, under pressure of what Professor Toynbee calls the "stimulus of penalizations," minorities round the world are rediscovering in the democratic idea "certain original meanings and values which Western Civilization has long ignored."³¹ We have structured the problem in this paper in terms of the conflict between (a) the American Creed, (b) the Southern Creed and (c) the new legal principle of racial integration in public schools. Our thesis has simply been that once the Southern Credo, the *unofficial law*, is effectively dealt with—by a deliberate, federally-sponsored plan and/or via research—implementation of the official law presents much less difficulty. An American educational system that grasps the full meaning of this struggle will have in large measure obviated the impending crisis of desegregation.

1. *Brown V. Board of Education of Topeka*, 74 S.C.T., 686 (1954), and *Bolling V. Sharpe*, 74 S.C.T., 693 (1954).

2. Ambrose Caliver, "Education for Negroes," *School Life*, vol. 36, No. 5, Feb. 1954, page 74. These seventeen states, according to Dr. Caliver, were Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

3. *Ibid.*, page 74. These states, according to Dr. Caliver, were Arizona, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

4. *Southern School News*, Nashville, Southern Education Reporting Service, vol. 1, No. 2, Oct. 1, 1954.

5. Carey McWilliams, "The Crisis of the Constitution," *Lawyers Guild Review*, vol. 14, No. 2, Summer, 1954, page 55.

6. "Because these are class actions, because of the wide applicability of this decision, and because of the great variety of local conditions, the formulation of decrees in these cases presents problems of considerable complexity. . . . In order that we may have the full assistance of

the parties in formulating decrees, the cases will be restored to the docket, and the parties are requested to present further argument on Questions 4 and 5 previously propounded by the Court for the reargument this term." *Brown V. Board of Education of Topeka*, 74 S.C.T., 686 (1954). Questions four and five which the Court asked in its June 8, 1953 order for reargument were as follows:

"(4) Assuming it is decided that segregation in public schools violates the Fourteenth Amendment

"(a) would a decree necessarily follow providing that, within the limits set by normal geographic school districting, Negro children should forthwith be admitted to schools of their choice, or

"(b) may this court, in the exercise of its equity powers, permit an effective gradual adjustment to be brought about from existing segregated systems to a system not based on color distinctions?

"(5) On the assumption on which questions 4(a) and (b) are based, and assuming further that this Court will exercise its equity powers to the end described

in question 4(b),

"(a) should this Court formulate detailed decrees in these cases;

"(b) if so what specific issues should the decrees reach;

"(c) should this Court appoint a special master to hear evidence with a view to recommending specific terms for such decrees;

"(d) should this Court remand to the Courts of first instance with directions to frame decrees in these cases, and if so, what general directions should the decrees of this Court include and what procedures should the Courts of first instance follow in arriving at the specific terms of more detailed decrees?"

Copied from the *Brief for Appellants in Nos. 1, 2, and 4 and for Respondents in No. 10 on Reargument* in the Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1953, page 14.

7. Justice William O. Douglas, "Stare Decisis," *Columbia Law Review*, vol. 49, June, 1949, page 735 ff.
8. Hodding Carter, "The Court's Decision and the South," *Reader's Digest*, September, 1954, pp. 51 ff.
9. Albert Coates and James C. N. Paul, "A Report to the Governor of North Carolina," *Popular Government*, September 1954. Mr. Coates and Mr. Paul give here a fairly careful analysis, without prejudice, of several legal alternatives to the Court's decision of May 17, 1954. See also Leflar and Davis, "Segregation in the Public Schools," 67 *Harv. L. Rev.* 377, 1954.
10. Kenneth B. Clark, "Desegregation: An Appraisal of the Evidence," *The Journal of Social Issues*, vol. 9, No. 4, 1953.
11. Ralph E. McGill, "Cultural Groups and Domestic Problems," in *Cultural Groups and Human Relations*, Karl W. Bigelow, Editor. (New York, Columbia University Bureau of Publications, 1951) pp. 57-75.
12. Gunnar Myrdal, *An American Dilemma*, (New York, Harper and Brother, 1944) Chapter One.
13. Pitirim Sorokin, *Society, Culture and Personality*. (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1947) pp. 70-85.
14. Lawrence K. Frank, *Society As the Patient*. (New Brunswick, Rutgers University Press, 1949) page 390.
15. Howard Odum, "An Approach To Diagnosis and Direction of the Problem of Negro Segregation in the Public Schools of the South," *Journal of Public Law*. vol. 3, No. 1, Spring, 1954, page 19.
16. *Ibid.*, page 19.
17. Sorokin, op. cit. page 83.
18. Aldous Huxley, *Ends and Means, An Enquiry Into the Nature of Ideals and Into the Methods Employed for Their Realization*. (London, Chatto and Windus).
19. Charles S. Johnson, "Cultural Groups and International Problems," in *Cultural Groups and Human Relations*, op. cit., page 41.
20. Guy B. Johnson, "A Sociologist Looks at Racial Desegregation in the South," *Social Forces*, vol. 33, No. 1, October 1954.
21. Olive Westbrooke Quinn, "The Transmission of Racial Attitudes Among White Southerners," *Social Forces*, vol. 33, No. 1, October, 1954, pp. 41-47.
22. Henry and Dana Lee Thomas, *Living Biographies*. (New York, Book League of America, 1943) pp. 35-47.
23. Richard W. Ervin, *Amicus Curae Brief of the Attorney General of Florida*, In the Supreme Court of the United States, October Term, 1954.
24. "Looking Forward," an editorial in *The Nation's Schools*, July, 1954, p. 25.
25. "Edwin M. Right, *The Threat of Soviet Imperialism*, (Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1954) page 306.
26. Op. cit., pp. 2-78.
27. Margaret Mead, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*. (Benedict, 1942) Also see especially Talcott Parsons, "Patterns of Aggression in the Western World" in his *Essays in Sociological Theory*. (Glencoe, The Free Press, 1954) Chapter 14, some of whose theories and hypotheses I am here suggesting.
28. Talcott Parsons and Edward Shils, *Toward A General Theory of Action*. (Cambridge, The Harvard University Press, 1952).
29. Gordon W. Allport, "Basic Principles in Improving Human Relations," in *Cultural Groups and Human Relations*, op. cit., pp. 8-28.
30. Robert M. MacIver, "The Deep Beauty of the Golden Rule" in *Moral Principles of Action*, Ruth Nanda Anshen, Editor. (New York, Harper and Brothers, 1952). pp. 39-47.
31. Arnold Toynbee, *The Study of History* (London, The Oxford Press, 1942) vol. I.

REVIEWS

Foreign Policy and Morality

Realities of American Foreign Policy, by George F. Kennan; Princeton University Press, Princeton; 1954; 120 pp. \$2.75.

The first, and also probably the most enduring, response which this book evokes from one who approaches it from a Christian perspective is one of profound gratitude—gratitude, namely, for a singularly sensitive and discerning analysis of some of the urgent and baffling issues which confront us as a nation burdened with the responsibilities of leadership at a critical moment in world history. The Christian spirit is bound to recognize qualities which are by no means foreign to its own authentic expressions in its author's acute sense of responsibility, in his studied attempts to meet the demand for a broad awareness of the underlying geopolitical realities, and in his obvious concern to be guided at all points in the matter of his own policy decisions by the humility which such an awareness necessarily prompts. Whether or not one is disposed to agree with all of the details of Mr. Kennan's analysis, he cannot but sense that these pages betray the workings of an extraordinarily competent and in some sense reverent mind, and must, accordingly, give thanks that he is able to benefit from such thinking.

Moreover, it will be acknowledged by anyone who has taken the trouble to discriminate the basic presuppositions which govern Mr. Kennan's analysis that the parallels between it and much responsible Christian thinking on contemporary social problems are not altogether accidental. Among the most fundamental of these presuppositions, for instance, are those which appear to define Mr. Kennan's doctrine of man. In one place, he speaks of government as "a chore devolving upon civilized society . . . as a result of man's irrational nature, his selfishness, his obstinacy, his tendency to violence" (p. 48). And in another, he refers to "the uncertain, suspicious little savage that lies at the bottom of almost every hu-

man heart" as the real and underlying evil which renders possible the success of the political demagogue and professional witch-hunter (p. 118). Furthermore, in such remarks as the following, one senses the influence of still another basic motif in traditional Christian anthropology: "The greatest law of human history is its unpredictability" (p. 92). Clearly it is a combination of this insight into human freedom and historical contingency and this awareness that human sin is by no means a variable historical factor which constitutes the anthropological foundation of Mr. Kennan's entire work. It is what lies behind his profound insistence that "we must be gardeners and not mechanics in our approach to world affairs" (p. 93) and his overall contention that it is only a *pragmatic* approach to international politics that can overcome the rigidity and injustice of self-righteousness and legalism (p. 36). It is also what lies behind his balanced view of the possibilities and limitations of organizational and legal structures in general and his conception of the United Nations in particular (pp. 17, 46, 105 ff.). And, ultimately, it is what lies behind his conviction that the basic problem which confronts us as we attempt to deal with the issues of foreign policy is ourselves (pp. 117f.).

In short, in his thorough-going "realism" with respect to human nature and in his unwillingness to blink at the implications for political action which follow from such a point of view, Mr. Kennan is in fundamental agreement with those "realistic" thinkers within the contemporary Church who have sought to get beyond the limitations and superficialities of the older liberal approach to political realities. He shares with them a profound scepticism concerning the relevance and utility of a moralistic approach to the problems of politics, and—in his own way, to be sure—thinks primarily in terms of the now-classic distinction between "moral man and immoral society."

But it is precisely at this point that the response of gratitude which I have suggested

a Christian is apt to feel toward this book is bound to be qualified by a different feeling. I cannot feel certain that Mr. Kennan has remained altogether faithful to the insight which the above distinction was coined to express; and I have found myself constantly asking, Is it just a *moralistic* approach to politics which he is intent upon challenging, or does he reject a *moral* approach as well? Is it moral man and *immoral* society he has in mind, or is he perhaps really talking about moral man and *amoral* society?

The latter interpretation seems not only to be suggested by many things Mr. Kennan has said previously in *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951; also reprinted as a Mentor Book [New York: New American Library, 1952]), but also to be required by a number of passages in this later book as well. One of these, for example, gives clear expression to his characteristic tendency to waver between statements which assert the *difficulty* of discerning the moral dimensions of international problems and others which appear to assert that such discernment is *impossible*.

"Let us face it [he says]: in most international differences elements of right or wrong, comparable to those that prevail in personal relationships, are—if they exist at all, which is a question—simply not discernible to the outsider (p. 36)."

This evidently leaves open the possibility that what we are dealing with in international relations are powers which are not subject to any moral criteria; and that the question of justice as between nation-states may simply be an irrelevant question. It is surely in terms of such a possibility that one must interpret such a passage at the following:

"A government is an agent, not a principal; and no more than any other agent may it attempt to be the conscience of its principal. In particular, it may not subject itself to those supreme laws of renunciation and self-sacrifice that represent the culmination of individual moral growth (p. 48)."

In one sense, such a statement would be hard to disagree with. A government plainly cannot simply sacrifice the interests of

its own people to those of some other nation and thereby be said to have fulfilled its moral responsibility. But does this perfectly obvious fact—the fact, that it is never an easy matter to decide fairly between several competing interests in relation to each of which one has a fundamental responsibility—mean that governments are therefore exempt from the criteria which define moral responsibility and exist for no other reason than to further the self-interest of their own particular peoples? Statements like the following would appear to imply an affirmative answer:

"... morality as a general criterion for the determination of the behavior of states and above all as a criterion for measuring and comparing the behavior of different states—no. Here other criteria, sadder, more limited, more practical, must be allowed to prevail (p. 49)"

It is the general train of thought which seems to find expression in such passages that makes it impossible, to be wholly satisfied that Mr. Kennan's is merely one more voice of protest against the irrelevance and, therefore, positive harmfulness of a moralistic approach to politics. Insofar as these statements are representative of his thinking, he surely is saying more than that; and, in my judgment, this "something more" is incompatible with a Christian point of view on the problem. Were it not for the haunting presence of another element in his analysis, it would be a comparatively easy matter to accept this implied amorality as representative and to reject it.

But, there is this other element. In one revealing passage, Mr. Kennan writes: "... the task of international politics is not to inhibit change but to find means to permit change to proceed without repeatedly shaking the peace of the world" (pp. 35-36). Anyone, who is familiar with Mr. Kennan's earlier book will readily agree that this emphasis upon "peace" as the controlling end of international politics is an element that is absolutely fundamental in his thought. In his judgment, the sole goal of political activity is the ever more adequate realization of a balance of power which will make possible stability in the relations be-

tween nations. His severe strictures against moralism, for instance, arise in no small part from his conviction that it is precisely moralism which lies behind the "total war" and "unconditional surrender" mentality; and that it is this mentality which more than anything else tends to upset the delicate balance of power upon which world peace depends.

But is it not true, as Reinhold Niebuhr has frequently argued, that justice and stability go hand in hand; and any social order which falls short in realizing justice is to that degree an unstable order? If this is so, then it would appear that insofar as Mr. Kennan postulates stability or "peace" as the goal of international politics he is also involved, if only implicitly, in asserting that the character of the relations between nations is fundamentally moral and that the latter are, indeed, subject to moral criteria. That Mr. Kennan himself is by no means unaware of this implication seems to be evident from such things as his obvious sympathy with the universal human longing for freedom (Cf. pp. 87 f., 94 f.) and his implied condemnation of the injustice of the earlier American foreign policy which completely ignored the legitimate aspirations of other peoples in its utopian concern with preserving the *status quo* (p. 16; cf. also *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950*, Mentor edition, p. 94).

Thus, if one takes seriously those statements by Mr. Kennan which appear to exempt the behavior of nations from moral criteria, it becomes impossible to understand his postulation of "peace" as the ideal which is regulative for international relations and his evident concern to promote approaches to foreign relations which as he says, "leave room for the application of equity and common sense" (p. 38). And, conversely, if one accepts his statements concerning the latter, one can hardly suppose his strictures against a moral approach to international politics to be more than a much-needed correction of the American (not to say human!) penchant for moralism, oversimplification, and self-righteousness.

I have already indicated I am by no means certain which of these alternatives more

nearly expresses Mr. Kennan's mind. But I am inclined to think that it is the latter which, in the final analysis, is more representative of his thought. For this reason I have ventured to suggest that the first impression created by his book tends also to be the most enduring one and to undercut any dismay which may be caused by his occasional failures to state his position in such a way as to differentiate it decisively from *Realpolitik*. Perhaps a more accurate way of expressing my judgment about this book would be to put it in terms of this hypothesis: If Mr. Kennan's analysis is to be rendered internally consistent, then it is necessary to accept this second interpretation.

That this hypothesis must, however, be construed in some sense as genuinely contra-factual will be disputed by no one who has been as disturbed as I have been by such things as the author's suggestion that morality is primarily an obligation to oneself (p. 47) and his tendency to be too uncritical in recommending that what is good for the United States is also good for the world-community (p. 61). It is just such things as these that render this book, not only logically, but—if I may so express it—also Christianly problematic.

SCHUBERT M. OGDEN

GOWNS PULPIT CHOIR

Satisfaction in Every Stitch since 1912

SUPERIOR WORKMANSHIP
QUALITY FABRICS
PERFECT FIT GUARANTEED

Write for catalog D-11

BENTLEY & SIMON

7 WEST 36 ST • NEW YORK 18, N. Y.



Otherworldliness and the New Testament

by **AMOS N. WILDER**

Is the Christian hope to be found **within** history (the American view)? Or is it to be found **beyond** history (the European view)? Dr. Wilder's book is a clear guide through the intricacies of both views as they derive from New Testament thought. From thence he soundly refutes charges that Christian hope is irrelevant to the problems of life. Both the student and the general reader will find guidance in this volume filled with flashing insights into a crucial modern theological problem. \$1.75

Be Not Afraid

STUDIES IN PERSONALIST SOCIOLOGY

by **EMMANUEL MOUNIER**

Translated by CYNTHIA ROWLAND

A stimulating contribution to Christian thinking on pressing theological and cultural issues of the day by a brilliant French philosopher. "The many readers of books on such topics as anxiety, courage, the meaning of history and personality will find here much to ponder and to be helped by." \$3.50

—ROGER HAZELTON

At your bookseller

HARPER & BROTHERS • NEW YORK 16 • N. Y.